From: Steven Craddock <scraddock@blm.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2015 3:55 PM

To: Closson, Dee A -FS

Cc: Hesch, Patricia -FS; Hunt, Valerie B -FS; John Beck

Subject: RE: 2760 - Sunshine CG Partial Withdrawal Revocation Request

Dee (and Valerie and Patricia),

I ran a few things past our WO Withdrawals coordinator today in preparation for submittal and to

ask him for an estimated timeframe. He informed me that the processing time for withdrawal

notices and PLOs is now frequently lasting six months — and that is for submittals are requesting

"priority" handling. This means it is very unlikely that we would have the PLO signed by June $\,$

even if we submitted a perfect package today.

I have made the preparation of this withdrawal package my first priority, but unfortunately it

shares that designation with several other "first priorities." I am making progress on it, but it may

take another week or two to get the package up to submittal standards, depending on the amount $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$

of time each day that I am able to dedicate to working on it.

That said, I'd like to come back to the Boundary Map. As I mentioned in an earlier message, we

recently submitted the Browns Canyon withdrawal package. This morning I received a message

that one of the maps we submitted was not acceptable. All of the information was correct, but the

colors weren't distinct enough for viewers to easily distinguish the different categories of land

status (yellows looked brown, blue state lands looked like water features, etc.). The map looked

fine to everyone here, but we're now redoing it with more distinctive colors.

I share this news with you as a recommendation that we address the blue line/red line issue on

the Boundary Map now. If we don't, we risk a delay down the line when one or more reviewers

complain that the map is inaccurate. The alternative is to place our bets on trying to explain the $\,$

reason for the gap between the lines where there should be none, but that risks losing more time

down the line. It's quite likely a reviewer will require that the map be revised to accurately

portray the relationship between the revocation area and the exchange parcel, so $\ensuremath{\text{I}}$ recommend

that we do whatever can be done to eliminate that risk now.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Steve Craddock Land Tenure Program Lead Colorado State Office - BLM

PH: 303-239-3707